



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 June 2025

by **O Tresise MSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/D/25/3364567

33 Henderson Road, Wandsworth, London SW18 3RR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr J O'Driscoll against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref is 2023/3363.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'Proposed mansard roof with front and rear dormer windows, following removal of existing third floor structure, raising of existing first floor rear roof, installation of pv solar panels and air conditioning units'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. As part of the appeal submission, the appellant has put forward a revised scheme, which proposes to use natural slate tiles rather than zinc on the proposed roof extension. Bird boxes are also added on the rear elevation of the main building. However, it is not the purpose of the appeal process to evolve a scheme, and it is therefore important that what is considered by the Inspector is essentially what was considered by the Council. I have proceeded to determine the appeal on the basis of the plans as originally submitted.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Wandsworth Common Conservation Area (WCCA).

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a three storey semi-detached residential building, which has additional accommodation at roof level. It is located within the Toast rack area, which is one of the character areas in the Wandsworth Common Conservation Area (WCCA). Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 (the Act) requires me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.
5. The special character of the WCCA designation is derived from its fine-grained pattern of development. The pattern of streets is mainly in the form of grids, essentially of two-three storey terraces, and semi-detached buildings of Victorian and Edwardian origin. The buildings are substantial, of two and three storeys, and are constructed mainly of red brick. The historic integrity and the architectural

quality of buildings contribute positively to the character and appearance of the WCCA as a whole and thereby its significance as a designated heritage asset.

6. The appeal proposal is to remove the existing structure at the roof level and replace it with a mansard roof incorporating three dormer windows to both the front and rear elevation. The proposed roof structure would have a steeply sloping to the front and rear with a large flat roof on top. It would also extend down to the eaves of the front elevation. As a result, it would be bulkier than the existing roof extension. Whilst the existing roof extension represents an incongruous addition, the proposal would create an alien feature that would detract from the established character of the area. The adverse effect would be exacerbated by the use of standing seam zinc, a material that would detract from the character and appearance of the WCCA. Consequently, the proposal would result in an inappropriate and unsympathetic addition to the building.
7. Accordingly, I find that the appeal proposal would harm the character and appearance of the main property and the WCCA. As such the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the WCCA. Due to the scale and nature of the proposed development, the harm to the heritage asset would be at the lower end of less than substantial.
8. The approach in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is that where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to a heritage asset, as in this case, that harm should be balanced against the public benefits of the proposal.
9. The use of sash windows would better reflect the character and appearance of the WCCA. There are other environmental benefits as it would incorporate solar panels on the rear elevation and a green roof on the raised flat roof at the rear. There are some associated temporary economic benefits from its construction. However, these benefits are limited by the small scale of the scheme before me. The improvements to the building's energy efficiency, thermal performance and the quality and functionality of the habitable space at third-floor level would amount to private benefits. The Framework indicates that great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset. I therefore find that the public benefits of the proposal would not outweigh the less than substantial harm identified, leading to conflict with the historic environment protection policies of the Framework.
10. The appellant outlines the scheme's compliance with a number of other policies of the Wandsworth Local Plan (2023) (the Local Plan) and the London Plan (2021). Compliance with these policies however does not outweigh or justify the scheme's noncompliance with the policies that seek to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the WCCA.
11. The Council did not refuse permission in respect of other matters, including living conditions and fire safety. The absence of harm in these respects means they are neutral factors in planning balance.
12. Overall, the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the WCCA. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policies LP1, LP3 and LP5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan (2023), and Policy HC1 (C) of the London Plan (2021). These seek for development, amongst other things, to protect designated heritage assets from proposals that would adversely affect their

significance. These policies also seek to achieve high quality design that respect the scale and character of the host building and the surrounding area. It would also conflict with s72(1) of the Act.

Conclusion

13. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

O Tresaie

INSPECTOR